UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/456,692	12/09/1999	STEVEN G. FRY	M-7916US	6777

33031	7590	03/11/2004

CAMPBELL STEPHENSON ASCOLESE, LLP
4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD.
BLDG. 4, SUITE 201
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER
COLIN, CARL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	5

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/456,692	FRY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Carl Colin	2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with th correspondenc address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _08 December 2003_ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-106_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-106_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on _08 December 2003_ is: a)☐ approved b)☒ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   In response to communications filed on 12/8/2003, applicant amends claims 12, 42, 55,

62, 77, 85, 91, and 97. Applicant adds claims 103-106. The following **claims 1-106** are

presented for examination.

2.   The amendments to the drawings, page 3, filed on 12/8/2003 have been considered but

they are objected to because the amended drawing does not include some of the elements of the

original drawing such as 131, 132,146, and 147, and as a result the amended figure 1 does not

include reference signs described on the specification. The amended figure 1 is not consistent

with the detailed description on the specification.

2.2   The amendments to the specification, page 2, filed on 12/8/2003 have been considered.

2.3   Applicant's arguments, page 29, filed on 12/8/2003, with respect to the rejection of

claims 55 and 62 under 35 USC 112 have been fully considered.

2.4   Applicant's arguments, pages 29-33, filed on 12/8/2003, with respect to the rejection of

claims 1-14, 16, 19-28, 33-44, 46, 47, and 50-84 under 35 USC 102 (b) have been fully

considered but are not fully persuasive. Regarding claims 1-14, 16, 19-28, 33-44, 46, 47, and

50-84, Applicant argues that the proxy agent disclosed by Coley et al. does not create a network

connection and the proxy agent does not initiate a connection. Examiner respectfully asserts that

Coley et al. in several embodiments recites the proxy agent "initiates a connection" (see column

6, lines 41-43; column 7, lines 53-55) just to name a few; the proxy agent "forms a connection"

(see column 8, line 66-67) that meets the recitation of creating a connection. Coley et al. further

discloses "the proxy agent opens and therefore manages a port connection" (see column 6, lines

16-19). However, in response to Applicant's argument about equating the web server to a

second communications program and Cooley host to second program, Applicant's argument is

persuasive because Coley et al. discloses a connection to a network element as referring to the

web server not to the router. Therefore, the proxy agent does create a connection, but not to a

second communications program as claimed in claim 1. For this reason, the rejection has been

withdrawn. The other limitations of the dependent claims disclosed by Coley et al. can still

apply, as Applicant does not argue them. Upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection

is made in view of another reference. Crichton et al. discloses a proxy capable of create

connection to both another communications program and a program. Regarding claims 85, 91

and 97, pages, 33-34, Applicant argues that Crichton et al. fails to teach "first and second

protocol daemons are capable of creating network connections", which is not claimed, and other

of the programs. Examiner respectfully asserts that Crichton et al. teaches end server proxy

capable of opening a connection to a program and opening connection to a middle proxy (see

column 5, lines 22-24 and lines 32-35 and 42-45). Therefore, Crichton et al. anticipates claims

85, 91 and 97 as amended and anticipates claims 86-90, 92-96, and 98-102.

Applicant's arguments, pages 34, 37-38, filed on 12/8/2003, with respect to the rejection

of Regarding claims 15, 17, 18, 45, 48- 49 and 29-32, have been fully considered but are not

persuasive. The rejection has been withdrawn because of Coley et al. for the same reasons

described above. The other limitations of claims disclosed by Crichton et al. can still apply, as

Applicant does not argue them. A new ground of rejection is made in view of Crichton et al.

under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b).

Drawings

3.   Fig. 1 is objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because it does not

include the reference signs **131, 132,146, and 147,** mentioned in the description on p.2.   A

proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to

avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in

abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
> and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it
> pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
> contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 14 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply

with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter, which was not

described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant

art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed

invention. The Applicant fails to recite that the relay program can create a network connection

as entered in the amendment of claim 12 "said first communications program creates said second

network connection". The protocol daemon creates program and relay program couples the in-

bound connection as described by Applicant on page 9, lines 1-3 and lines 28-30.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form

the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another

filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an

international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and

(4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999

(AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002

do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA

35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5.1   **Claims 1-106** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent

6,104,716 to **Crichton et al.**.

5.2   **As per claim 1, Crichton et al.** discloses a method of communicating information

between a first program and a second program over a network comprising: relaying said

information between a server and a server end proxy that meets the recitation of said first

program and a first communications program over a first network connection (see column 10,

lines 12-13 and 4-5); relaying said information between said server end proxy and another proxy

that meets the recitation of first communications program and a second communications program

over a second network connection (see column 10, lines 17-23), wherein said first

communications program creates said second network connection to said second

communications program through a first firewall program (see column 10, lines 17-23), said first

firewall program prevents access to said first program initiated by said second program (see

column 10, lines 39-43), and said second network connection is initiated by said first

communications program (see column 10, lines 17-23); and relaying said information between a

proxy and a client that meets the recitation of said second communications program and said

second program over a third network connection (see column 10, lines 17-24 and column 8, lines

60-67).

       As per claim 2, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 1, wherein said

first program, said first communications program, said second communications program and said

first firewall program are executed on a first computer system (see col. 9, lines 50-56 and lines 63-67).

As per claim 3, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 1, wherein said second communications program and said second program are executed on a first computer system (see col. 9, lines 50-56 and lines 63-67).

As per claim 4, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 1, wherein said first communications program is a protocol daemon (see column 5, lines 32-45 and column 5, lines 54-56) and said second communications program is a relay program (see column 5, lines 11-12).

As per claim 5, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 1, wherein said first firewall program also prevents access to said first program initiated by said second communications program (see column 10, lines 36-41).

As per claim 6, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 1, wherein said first communications program relays said information between said first and said second network connections (see column 5, lines 55-57 and lines 33-35).

As per claim 7, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 1, wherein said second communications program relays said information between said second and said third network connections (see column 10, lines 17-24 and column 8, lines 60-67).

As per claim 8, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 1, wherein said

first program requires said first network connection to be initiated as an in-bound network

connection relative to said first program (see column 5, lines 22-24 and lines 32-35), said first

network connection is initiated by said first communications program, and said first network

connection is in-bound relative to said first program (see column 5, lines 22-24 and lines 32-35).

As per claim 9, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 1, wherein said

first firewall program prevents access to said first program by preventing an in-bound network

connection to said first program (see column 10, lines 36-41), and said second network

connection is created as an out-bound network connection from said first communications

program to said second communications program (see column 10, lines 17-24).

As per claim 10, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 1, wherein

said third network connection is created through a second firewall program, said second firewall

program prevents access to said second program initiated by said second communications

program (see column 10, lines 25-30), and said third network connection is initiated by said

second program (see column 5, lines 49-51).

As per claim 11, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 10, wherein said

second firewall program prevents access to said second program by inhibiting an in-bound

network connection to said second program said in-bound network connection being in-bound

relative to said second program (see column 10, lines 25-30).

As per claim 12, Crichton et al. substantially discloses a method of communicating

information between a first program and a second program over a network comprising: relaying

said information between said first program and a first communications program over a first

network connection, wherein said first program creates said first network connection to said first

communications program through a first firewall program, said first firewall program prevents

access to said first program initiated by a second program, and said first network connection is

initiated by said first program (see column 3, lines 55-66); **Crichton et al.** also discloses

relaying said information between said first communications program and said second program

over a second network connection, wherein said first communications program create said

second network connection (see column 5, lines 44-45) and (see column 5, lines 22-24 and lines

32-35).

As per claim 13, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 12, wherein said

first program, said first communications program, and said first firewall program are executed on

a first computer system (see col. 9, lines 50-56 and lines 63-67).

As per claim 14, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 12, wherein said

first communications program is a relay program (see column 5, lines 11-12).

As per claim 15, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 12, wherein said first firewall prevents access to said first program initiated by said first communications program (see column 3, lines 55-66).

As per claim 16, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 12, wherein said first firewall program prevents access to said first program by preventing an in-bound network connection to said first program and said first network connection is created as an out-bound network connection from said first program to said first communications program (see column 3, lines 55-66)

As per claims 17-18, Crichton et al. discloses the limitation of a second network connection created from said second program to a first communications program through a second firewall program that prevents in-bound access (see column 4, lines 25-30). The connection in claims 17-18 is well known in the art and admitted in applicant's figure 1 prior art on page 2, lines 1-5.

As per claims 19 and 22, Crichton et al. discloses a method of communicating information over a network comprising: relaying said information between a first program and a first communications program over a first network connection wherein said first program requires said first network connection to be initiated as an in-bound network connection relative to said first program (see column 5, lines 22-24 and lines 32-35), said first network connection is initiated by said first communications program, and said first network connection is in-bound

relative to said first program (see column 5, lines 22-24 and lines 32-35). **Crichton et al.**
discloses creating connection to program as recited above and discloses relaying information
between said first communications program and second program (see column 5, lines 22-45).
Crichton et al. discloses relaying said information between said first communications program
and a second program over a second network connection, wherein said first communications
program creates said second network connection to a second program through a first firewall
program, said first firewall program prevents access to said first program initiated by said second
program and said second network connection is initiated by said first communications program
(see column 4, lines 20-67). **Crichton et al.** further discloses that a proxy is capable of creating
connection to program as mentioned above, and discloses relaying information between said first
communications program and second program (see column 5, lines 32-45).

As per claim 20, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 19, wherein said
first program, said first communications program, said second communications program and said
first firewall are executed on a first computer system (see col. 9, lines 50-56 and lines 63-67).

As per claim 21, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 19, wherein said
first communications program is a protocol daemon (see column 5, lines 32-45).

Claim 23 is similar to claim 1, and further discloses creating a connection between a
second program and a second communications program (see column 9, lines 1-12). Therefore
claim 23 is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 24-26 are similar to the rejected **claims 2-4**. Therefore, **claims 24-26** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 2-4.

Claims 27-28 are similar to the rejected **claims 9-10**. Therefore, **claims 27-28** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 9-10.

As per **claim 29, Crichton et al.** discloses the step of passing said first instance of said password flow between communications program and the second program (column 2, lines 28-47 and column 5, lines 18-23 see also column 6 line 39 through column 9) and discloses communication with two proxies as in figure 9, that meets the recitation of providing said second instance of said password to said second program; passing said second instance of said password from said second program to said second communications program during creation of said third network connection and associating said second connection with said third connection using said first and said second instances of said password.

As per **claim 30, Crichton et al.** discloses the claimed method of claim 29, wherein said passing said first instance of said password further comprises entering information regarding said second network regarding said password in a connection list maintained by said second communications program said first instance of said password being entered in a password entry (see column 5, lines 46-67 and column 6, lines 47-63). See also (column 6 line 39 through column 9).

As per claims 31-32, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 29, further

comprises matching said second instance of said password with said password entry in said

connection list, said password entry containing said password (see column 8, lines 1-16 and

column 8, lines 24-52); entering information regarding said third network connection in said

connection list; and associating said second and third connections (column 5, lines 1-16 and lines

46 et seq.; column 8, lines 24-52; see also claims 4-5).

Claims 33-35 are similar to the rejected **claims 1, 2, and 5** respectively except for

incorporating the claimed methods into a computer program. Therefore, **claims 33-35** are

rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 1,2, and 5.

As per claim 36, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 33 wherein said

first program is executed on a first processor, said first communications program is executed on a

second processor, said second communications program is executed on a third processor and said

second program is executed on a fourth processor (see column 9, lines 60-67).

Claim 37 recites the same limitation found in the rejected claim 36. Therefore, **claim 37**

is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 36.

Claims 38-43 are similar to the rejected **claims 8-13** respectively except for

incorporating the claimed methods into a computer program. Therefore, **claims 38-43** are

rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 8-13.

Claim 44 recites the same limitation found in the rejected claim 37. Therefore, **claim 44**

is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 37.

Claim 45 recites the same limitation found in the rejected claim 15. Therefore, **claim 44**

is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 15.

Claims 46-47 are similar to the rejected **claims 14 and 16** respectively. Therefore,

claims 46-47 are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 14 and 16.

Claims 48-49 are similar to the rejected **claims 17 and 18** respectively. Therefore,

claims 46-47 are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 17 and 18.

Claims 50-53 are similar to the rejected **claims 19-22** respectively except for

incorporating the claimed methods into a computer program. Therefore, **claims 50-53** are

rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 19-22.

As per claim 54, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 54 a network

comprising: a first program executed on a first computer; a first firewall program executed on a

second computer coupled to said first computer; a second program executed on a third computer

coupled to said second computer (see figures 1-4); and a third program executed on a fourth

computer coupled to said third computer, wherein said first firewall program is configured to

prevent access to said first program initiated by said third program (see column 3, lines 40 et

seq.), said first program is configured to initiate a first network connection to said second

program through said first firewall program (see column 10, lines 17-23), and said second

program and said third program are configured to support a second network connection between

said second program and said third program (see figures 1-4).

As per claim 55, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed network of claim 54, wherein said

first program, said first communications program, and said second program are executed on said

first computer (see col. 9, lines 50-56 and lines 63-67).

As per claim 56, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed network of claim 54, wherein said

second program and said third program are executed on said fourth computer (see figures 1-4).

As per claim 57, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed network of claim 54, further

comprising: a second firewall program executed on a fifth computer coupled between said third

computer and said fourth computer (see figures 1-4) and (see col. 9, lines 50-56 and lines 63-67).

To one skilled in the art, the addition of a second firewall does not depart from the scope and

spirit of the invention described by **Crichton et al.**.

As per claim 58, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed network of claim 54, wherein said

second firewall program is configured to prevent access to said third program initiated by said

first program (see column 3, lines 40 et seq.),

As per claim 59, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed method of claim 54, wherein said

second firewall program prevents access to said third program by inhibiting an in-bound network

connection to said third program, said in-bound network connection being in-bound relative to

said third program (see column 3, lines 40 et seq.),

As per claim 60, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed network of claim 57. Claim 60

recites the same concept of firewall that prevents inbound connection of the protected side

disclosed by Crichton et al. (see claim 54).

Claim 61 recites the same limitation found in the rejected claim 16. Therefore, claim 61

is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 16.

Claim 62 recites the same limitation found in the rejected claim 17. Therefore, claim 62

is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 17.

As per claim 63, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed network of claim 54, further

comprising: a fourth program executed on a fifth computer coupled to said first computer,

wherein said first program is configured to initiate a third network connection to said fourth

program, said third network connection being in bound relative to said fourth program, and said

fourth program is configured to require said third network connection to be initiated as an

in-bound network connection relative to said fourth program (see figures 1-4 and claim 8). To

one skilled in the art, the addition of another computer and another program does not depart from

the scope and spirit of the invention described by **Crichton et al.** (see col. 9, lines 50-56 and

lines 63-67).

Claims 64 and 65 recite the same limitation found in the rejected claim 60. Therefore,

claims 64 and 65 are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 60.

Claims 66, 67, and 68 recite the same limitation found respectively in the rejected claims

16, 10, and 59. Therefore, **claims 66, 67, and 68** are rejected on the same rationale as the

rejection of claims 16, 10, and 59.

As per claims 69-70, claim 69 some of the limitations of claim 54 and adds said second

program is configured to initiate a second network connection to said first program, said second

network connection being in-bound relative to said first program said first program is configured

to initiate a first network connection to said second program through said first firewall program

(see figure 2) disclosed by **Crichton et al.**.

Claim 71 recites the same limitation found in the rejected claim 22 and claim 60.

Therefore, **claim 71** is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 60.

Claims 72 and 75 recite the same limitation found in the rejected claim 60. Therefore, **claims 72 and 75** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 60.

Claims 73 and 74 recite the same limitation found in the rejected claims 19 and 21. Therefore, **claims 73 and 74** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 19 and 21.

Claim 76 recites the same limitation found in the rejected claim 2. Therefore, **claim 76** is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 2.

Claim 77 is similar to the rejected **claim 73** except for incorporating the claimed methods into a computer system comprising a processor, computer readable medium coupled to said processor, and computer code, encoded in said computer readable medium. Therefore, **claim 77** is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 73.

Claims 78-79 are similar to the rejected **claims 74 and 75** respectively. Therefore, **claims 78-79** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 74 and 75.

As per claim 80, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed system of claim 77, **Claim 80** recites the same limitation found in claim 77. Therefore, claim 80 is rejected on the same rationale as the rejected claim 77.

Claims 81-83 are similar to the rejected claims 73-75 respectively except for

incorporating the claimed methods into a computer program. Therefore, claims 81-83 are

rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 73-75.

As per claim 84, Crichton et al. discloses the claimed program of claim 81, wherein

said first, second, and said third sets of instructions are executed on a single computer system

(see col. 9, lines 50-56 and lines 63-67).

As per claim 85, Crichton et al. discloses a method of communicating information

between a first program and a second program over a network comprising: creating a first

out-bound network connection between said first program and a first communications program

through a first firewall program, wherein said first out-bound network connection is created by a

protocol daemon that creates a first network connection and a second network connection, said

first network connection is between said first program and said first protocol daemon, and is in-

bound to said first program (see column 5, lines 22-24 and lines 32-35), said second network

connection is between said first protocol daemon and first communications program and is out-

bound to said first protocol daemon (see column 5, lines 22-24 and lines 32-35), said first

out-bound network connection is out-bound relative to said first program (see column 5, lines

22-24 and lines 32-35), and said first firewall program prevents in-bound access to said first

program (see column 10, lines 39-43); and creating a second out-bound network connection

between said second program and said first communications program through a second firewall

program (see figure 4), wherein said second out-bound network connection is created by a

protocol daemon that creates a third network connection and a fourth network connection (see

column 10, lines 15-28) and **Crichton et al.** clearly discloses a proxy capable of creating two

connections (see column 5, lines 22-24 and lines 32-35 and 42-45), said third network

connection is between said second program and said second protocol daemon, and is in-bound to

said second program (see column 5, lines 22-24 and lines 32-35), said fourth network connection

is between said second protocol daemon and first communications program and is out-bound to

said second protocol daemon (see column 5, lines 49-53), see column 10, lines 15-28) and

Crichton et al. clearly discloses a proxy capable of creating two connections (see column 5,

lines 22-24 and lines 32-35 and 42-45) and multiple proxy connections (see column 8, lines 54-

59) said second out-bound network connection is out-bound relative to said second program, and

said second firewall program prevents in-bound access to said second program and relaying said

information between said first out-bound network connection and said second out-bound

network connection, said relaying performed by said first communications program (see figure

4).

As per claim 86, **Crichton et al.** discloses the claimed method of claim 85, wherein said

first communications program is a relay program (see column 5, lines 11-16).

As per claims 87-88, **Crichton et al.** discloses the claimed method of claim 85, further

comprising: creating a third out-bound network connection from said first program to a third

program (see col. 9, lines 50-56 and lines 63-67 and figures 1-3). To one skilled in the art, the

addition of a second firewall does not depart from the scope and spirit of the invention described

by **Crichton et al.**.

As per claim 89, **Crichton et al.** discloses the claimed method of claim 85, wherein said

first program, said first communications program and said first firewall program are executed on

a first computer system (see col. 9, lines 50-56 and lines 63-67).

As per claim 90, **Crichton et al.** discloses the claimed method of claim 85, wherein said

second program, said first communications program and said second firewall program are

executed on a first computer system (see col. 9, lines 50-56 and lines 63-67).

Claims 91-96 are similar to the rejected **claims 85-90** except for incorporating the

claimed methods into a computer system comprising a processor, computer readable medium

coupled to said processor, and computer code, encoded in said computer readable medium.

Therefore, **claims 91-96** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 85-90.

Claims 97-102 are similar to the rejected **claims 85-90** except for incorporating the

claimed methods into a program product encoded in computer readable media. Therefore,

claims 97-102 are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 85-90.

As per claim 103, claim 103 recites the same limitation found in claims 23 and 29 and

therefore claim 103 is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 23 and 29.

Claims 104-106 are similar to the rejected claims 30-32 respectively and are rejected on

the same rationale as the rejection of claims 30-32.

Conclusion

6.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

6.1   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's
disclosure.
        a. US Patent   6,473,406   Coile et al.

This patent pertains to a transparent proxy that creates connection to programs and relays

information. Many of the claimed features, i.e. creating connections to programs, relaying

information, proxy list, etc. are disclosed in this reference.

b. US Patent Publication   US 2002/0004847   Tanno

This patent pertains to a remote operation service between devices equipped with a

firewall. Many of the claimed features, i.e. creating connections to computers, relaying

information, password authentication, various physical connection, etc. are disclosed in this

reference.

6.2   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Carl Colin whose telephone number is 703-305-0355. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday and every other Friday, 8:00-

6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

_ce_

Carl Colin

Patent Examiner

March 5, 2004